DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 468 674 EA 031 979

AUTHOR	Allan, Elizabeth J.; Estler, Suzanne E.
TITLE	Difference, Disadvantage, Privilege and Us: Examining Meanings of Diversity among Educational Leadership Faculty.
PUB DATE	2002-04-00
NOTE	43p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 1-5, 2002).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Administrator Education; *Cultural Differences; Ethnic Bias; Higher Education; *Instructional Development; *Instructional Leadership; *Leadership Training; Racial Bias; Social Bias

ABSTRACT

Higher education in the United States has a history of opening its doors to broader populations of students as exemplified by the Morrill Act and the GI Bill. The reality, however, of modifying curricula and courses already parceled among faculty with varying specialties, varying levels of expertise related to diversity, and with already full syllabi can be daunting. This study investigated an educational leadership faculty's commitment to examine meanings, implications, and challenges of diversity for its graduate programs in school and postsecondary educational leadership with the goal of improving its curriculum. A descriptive within-site case-study approach was used. Data were collected from documents, interviews, and participant observation, and analyzed qualitatively. Concepts such as white privilege provide a powerful tool for understanding how even the best intentions of individuals can thwart efforts to understand and appreciate issues of diversity. Participants in the study discussed the various aspects of incorporating notions of diversity into school leadership curricula. Challenges, including administrative resistance, teaching practices, and perceptions about diversity formed in a predominately white environment, were also discussed. Implications for faculty development strategies and institutional support for curricular inclusivity are discussed. An appendix charts educational leadership across the curriculum timeline. (Contains 53 references.) (RT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 468 674

Difference, Disadvantage, Privilege and Us: Examining Meanings of Diversity Among Educational Leadership Faculty

Elizabeth J. Allan

and

Suzanne E. Estler

University of Maine
Orono, Maine

American Educational Research Association
April 2002
New Orleans, LA

EA031979

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

E. ALLAN

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTRODUCTION

Higher education in the United States has a history of opening its doors to broader populations of students as exemplified by the Morrill Acts, and the GI Bill. Most university faculty preparing leaders for K-12 or postsecondary settings in a democratic society in 2002 would agree that sensitivity to and the ability to engage with issues of diversity should be essential outcomes of their graduate programs. That said, however, the reality of systematically modifying curricula and courses already parceled among faculty with varying specialties, varying levels of expertise related to diversity and with already full syllabi can be daunting.

This study investigates an educational leadership faculty's collective and universal commitment to examine meanings, implications and challenges of diversity for its graduate programs in school and postsecondary educational leadership with the ultimate goal of improving its curriculum. In this paper we report the process and interim effects of the continuing project based on a "snapshot in time" at the conclusion of the second academic year of a multi-year process. We describe a rich, textured case study of the process and challenges of deep curricular change around complex issues in a university setting and the larger society.

SIGNIFICANCE

The significance of these efforts lay in the broader question of how faculties, many of whom reflect a more homogeneous time and culture, can be responsive to their responsibilities to changing American demographics. The diverse world in which K-12 and postsecondary students live and work requires institutional leaders able to build successful and affirming diverse educational climates. Therefore, faculty educating those

leaders must be able to implement curricula that integrate the skills and knowledge for cultivating diversity-sensitive leadership. Numerous studies have investigated diversity in relation to teaching behaviors, curriculum and student learning (Grant & Gomez, 2000; hooks, 1994; McCormick, 1994; Morey & Kitano, 1996; Nieto, 1999). This study builds on and expands this literature by examining how a group of faculty worked to develop both a contemporary understanding of the challenges of diversity in educational organizations and teaching practices.

The promise and problems of diversity in U.S. higher education have been a key focus for both scholars and practitioners of postsecondary education (Orfield, 2001; Turner et al., 1996). While scholars have been attentive to the challenges of diversity for educational leaders (Capper, 1993; Lindsey et al., 1999; Shakeshaft, 1989; Tierney, 1993), comparatively few have examined the process by which faculty examine their own understandings about socio-cultural identity differences and consider how their scholarship, teaching and service are shaped through these lenses.

PURPOSE AND QUESTIONS

The purpose of this case study is to gain a better understanding of how, why and with what curricular effects a graduate faculty in educational leadership (at a rural and predominantly white public university in the U.S.) collectively and individually examined meanings and implications of diversity for their curriculum and teaching. We were particularly interested in describing how individual faculty members, whose students are not confronted with racial diversity on a daily basis, articulate the need and develop strategies for integrating socio-cultural difference throughout the curriculum. Further, we wanted to examine how meanings of leadership and diversity shifted over time and study

how these meanings contributed to curricular and teaching changes. Thus, the following questions were developed as a guide:

Research Questions

1. How does a group of Educational Leadership faculty members at a predominantly white rural university work collectively to promote scholarly engagement around the issue of diversity?
2. How do individuals and the group think about diversity and its relevance to educational leadership and how do these shift over a two-year period of focused reading and dialogue?
3. Why does a faculty choose to pursue collaborative exploration of issues related to diversity over an extended period of time?
4. What pedagogical changes result from this process?

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

The intersection of a number of scholarly perspectives informs our analysis and interpretations of the data. The most salient lenses draw from interdisciplinary perspectives in the following areas: (1) Theories of Difference, Privilege & Whiteness (2) Leadership (3) Faculty Development and (4) Organization Theory. Brief descriptions follow:

Theories of Difference, Privilege & Whiteness

Scholarship on the construction and meaning of difference and its connections to socio-political power and identity have gained intellectual prominence and political urgency in a number of academic arenas including literary criticism, cultural studies, women's studies, gay and lesbian studies, queer theory, critical legal studies, critical race

theory and anthropology (Ellsworth & Miller, 1996; Weedon, 1999). Our analysis of the data is informed by scholarship across a number of these fields. In particular, we draw on influences of postmodern perspectives as they have contributed to understanding difference as multiplistic, local and shifting. For example, West and Fenstermaker (1995) argue that difference should be configured as an "ongoing interactional accomplishment," in contrast to the fixed and isolated nature of bounded category schemes (e.g. race, class, sex, ethnicity, and sexuality) that typically are used to characterize difference in the context of educational policy.

Theories of privilege and the "invisibility of privilege" (McIntosh, 1993; Johnson, 2001) are central to this study as well. In this context, theories of privilege are predicated upon socio-cultural understandings of sexism, racism, heterosexism/homophobia and other forms of institutionalized prejudice. Unlike overt forms of discrimination and prejudice, privilege is often invisible to those who possess it—yet operates powerfully to disadvantage those who are not part of the dominant group. Theories of privilege help to explain how well intentioned educators may unwittingly behave in ways that contribute to campus and classroom climates that marginalize, exclude and disadvantage members of historically oppressed groups.

Our analysis is also informed by the relatively recent body of scholarship related to the social construction of whiteness as an identity category (Clark & O'Donnell, 1999; Fine et al, 1999; Frankenburg, 1993; Kincheloe et al., 1998). Like theories of privilege, understanding whiteness as a social construct is particularly helpful in offering more complex conceptualizations of "diversity" and "multiculturalism."

Faculty Development

Over the past decade there has been a proliferation of academic writing related to faculty development and the improvement of teaching (Baiocco & DeWaters, 1998; Chickering & Kytle, 1999; Chism, 1999; Cross, 1998; McKeachie, 1999; Walsh & Maffei, 1994). We draw upon this scholarship to frame our thinking about the application and significance of our findings for improving learning for all students. In writing about research-based principles for improving higher learning in classrooms, Angelo (1993) states, "Interaction between teachers and learners is one of the most powerful factors in promoting learning" (p. 7). One of the important implications of this study is examining how faculty understandings and awareness of diversity can improve classroom climates to ensure that everyone has a fair chance to master course material. In a university setting, where curriculum is typically linked to the expertise of individual faculty, this process of faculty development is essential to curricular change.

Organization Theory

There is a growing body of scholarship related to the nature of colleges and universities as complex organizations and resulting implications for change processes within them (Cameron, 1989; Cohen, March and Olsen, 1972; Cohen and March, 1974; Kezar, 2001; March and Olsen, 1976, Sporn, 1999; Weick, 1974). This literature leads us to consider decision-making in colleges and universities as characterized by ambiguity in goals, fluid participation, and unclear technologies for achieving goals. Further, it leads us to consider the attention of participants as a scarce resource, subject to the effects of competing demands, duty, individual preferences and chance.

METHODS

This investigation employs a descriptive within-site case study design to examine the concerted, multi-year effort of an Educational Leadership graduate faculty to explore issues of diversity in an attempt to more fully integrate diversity into individual courses and the curriculum as a whole. We selected this approach as it is particularly well suited for holistically describing a particular event, program, person or organization that is bounded by time and place (Creswell, 1998) allowing for a full consideration of the context, depth and rich detail (Patton, 1990; Berg, 2001). Our approach might also be considered an instrumental case study since the focus of investigation makes it well suited as an example of a process for faculty development and curriculum transformation efforts designed to enhance diversity. The study clearly fits within the tradition of action research. It is characterized by a simultaneous, cyclical, and interactive pursuit of action or change and research or critical reflection. In the cyclical process associated with action research, methods, data and interpretation are refined through ongoing cycles of action and reflection. Such research is informed by both feminist and critical perspectives where the researchers work with participants as agents of change (Glesne, 1999). While the project was initially conceived relative to action only, it evolved in time to include a participant research component that clearly impacted the action process.

Data Sources

Data collection for this study involved multiple sources of information. Data sources included: (1) documents (meeting minutes, email communication, flipchart notes and other writing); (2) a one-hour interview with each participating faculty member focusing on how they viewed the process and resulting changes in their teaching

practices; (3) a follow-up de-briefing/interview session with each faculty member (approx. 30-45minutes each). (4) participant observation (including researcher notes of meetings, individual conversations and other meeting contexts)—as faculty members in the area, we participated in the process—providing for full contextual engagement; and (5) on-going opportunities for individuals to respond to our researcher notes served as "member-checks" to enhance trustworthiness of the data.

It was our initial intent to audiotape individual interviews and group dialogue; however, one participant was uncomfortable with this approach. Not wanting to jeopardize what we already perceived to be a fragile project, we chose not to tape record sessions. Instead, we took copious notes by hand and typed them up for participating faculty to review (member-checks) for accuracy.

Analysis

In describing the case and providing our analysis and interpretations, we build on the work of Lincoln and Guba (1985) who delineate a case study structure as: the problem, context, issues and lessons learned. Using established methods of qualitative inquiry as a guide, we used coding and categorizing processes that made use of both inductive and deductive approaches (Bogdan & Biklen, 1992; Coffey & Atkinson, 1996; Miles and Huberman, 1984) to establish analytic themes from the data and make assertions about the case. Data were analyzed by hand and through the use of HyperResearch, a computer software package for qualitative research.

Limitations and Validity

When considering a case study at a single institution, the strength of the method is also its greatest limitation. It allows for a rich, contextual examination, but at the cost of generalizability. Similarly, the participation of the authors as both actors and researchers in the process provides important access to data and interpretation of fine detail at a possible cost of potential bias resulting from that engagement. In light of these limitations, we have worked to promote the soundness and validity of this study through attention to detail, triangulation of methods, member-checks and peer-debriefing. Importantly, we do not claim to produce generalizable conclusions through this work. Rather, the case study method is best suited to provide insights and assertions that are transferable to other settings. Our access to data and our analytic insights were strengthened in some ways by our role as participant-researchers. At the same time, we must also acknowledge how this role might have imposed limitations including for example, our interest in respecting competing demands on colleagues' time, thus, limiting the time allotted for individual interviews.

Recognizing the "researcher as instrument" in qualitative inquiry and that "where you sit influences what you see" it is important that we position ourselves as both participants and analysts in the context of this case study. We are both white, middle class, feminist, academic women separated in age by a generation. Our perspectives have been influenced by our life experiences: In one case, by coming of age during the Civil Rights movement and subsequent engagement in the development of women's studies and women's research centers, and in a decade of administrative service shepherding the institution's equal opportunity and affirmative action efforts. In the other case, coming of

age consciously aware of the ongoing legacy and struggles of both the Civil Rights and women's movements and the more recent gay rights movement.

In many ways we share common experiences, though in different times, but we also differ in many respects. While we are both untenured, one has been at the institution many years and the other but two years. One assumed administrative responsibilities as Director of Equal Opportunity prior to a tenure decision, and returned to the faculty after a decade immersed in the ways differences profoundly affect individuals and processes within the institution. Those years of practice also distanced her from a doctoral education steeped in positivist research traditions. The other is a relatively recent doctorate with more systematic formal education related to diversity research, post-positivist research methods and a theoretical grounding for understanding a postmodern world. We are both trained and maintain scholarly focus in higher education, but in one case with greater focus on the individual student and the other with greater focus on organizational dynamics. One of us is a lesbian delighting in time with grand nieces and nephews and the other is immersed in the challenge of simultaneously nurturing an academic career and a young family among a colleague group that has seen children grow and leave the nest. As the only two faculty members in Educational Leadership with research and teaching focused in higher education programs, we are of the Educational Leadership faculty at our institution, but also stand apart from it in many of our professional activities. Indeed, this project provided a common thread among the collective group.

We believe our differences bring complementary perspectives in considering the data and their implications. At the same time, our common experiences could blind us to

some aspects of the data. Consciousness of the dangers and review of the case by those with differing experience is intended to heighten the breadth and depth of our interpretations.

FINDINGS

Having "taken a snapshot" in time of what some might describe as an unusual commitment, an ongoing, multi-year joint exploration of diversity and its place in the Educational Leadership curricula, what have we learned from the experience to date? This section provides preliminary findings based on the analysis of the case study relative to each research question. An overview of the case itself is presented in response to the initial research question regarding how a faculty engaged around the issue of diversity. The description of the case is followed by a discussion of findings relative to research questions 2, 3, and 4. Interpretations of each question are ultimately integrated in themes revealed through the case study.

How does a group of Educational Leadership faculty members at a predominantly white rural university work collectively to promote scholarly engagement around the issue of diversity?

Context and Participants

Faculty members involved in this project are all affiliated with the Educational Leadership unit in the College of Education and Human Development at a New England state system's flagship and land grant institution. At 96.9% white, the state was the least racially diverse state in the 2000 census. The state is marked by pockets of extreme

poverty especially in communities struggling with heavy unemployment as primary industries have either left the state or become largely mechanized. Its Native American population represents four federally recognized tribes, two of which occupy sovereign reservations, one within five miles of the campus. The University community in many ways reflects the demographics of the state with 4% of both the student body and professional/faculty workforce self-reporting as representing a racial minority. Hourly staff is composed of 2% people of color.

The Educational Leadership area (EDL) provides graduate preparation programs (M.Ed., CAS, and Ed.D.) in both K-12 and Higher Educational Leadership. The Educational Leadership area and the College of Education and Human Development place high value on its connections with the field enacted through both teaching and service. Thus, faculty members are often away from campus with field based activities and course delivery. Only two of the eight serve as faculty for the concentration in Higher Education.

Seven of the eight faculty members in this Educational Leadership graduate education program agreed to participate in the Diversity Across the Curriculum (DAC) reading grant awarded in response to a proposal for faculty development. The eighth faculty member, long an advocate of and initiator of such discussion, opted to disengage as she focused on her own professional transition upon an adverse tenure decision. All of the EDL faculty members are white and currently middle class, but several have working class backgrounds. Three of the participants are male and four are female. The only tenured members of the group are two of the men—one with full professor status. One member of the group publicly identifies as lesbian. All are relatively able-bodied and of

Judeo-Christian heritage. All but one faculty participant came to adulthood in the 1960's except for one participant who was born during that decade.

Beginnings

Our focused dialogues on "diversity as an educational leadership issue" began in the wake of the 2000 election when a statewide referendum to ratify legislation calling for nondiscrimination in sexual orientation approved by the majority of both houses and signed by the governor, failed to pass despite polls preceding the election that projected overwhelming support. This event inspired a number of faculty members to call on their colleagues to consider the responsibility of educational leaders to identify, understand and communicate more inclusive attitudes and behaviors among students, teachers, parents and the community in general. Several questions were defined for discussion at a subsequent faculty meeting—how is diversity an educational leadership issue? What is our responsibility as an Educational Leadership faculty of the state's flagship campus to promote acceptance of identity differences? How does our curriculum and teaching promote educational environments that foster learning for all students?

The faculty, as a collective, considered these questions important enough to set aside additional time for faculty gatherings to further explore these questions and the issues raised by them. From October, 2000-June, 2001, faculty participated in four 2-hour sessions centered on the topic of diversity and leadership. At these meetings, the faculty engaged in focused readings, discussions and dialogue with students of color and GLBT- identified students who were invited to provide their perspectives on classroom climates at the university. The interest in pursuing the topic further led several faculty members, with the support of the group, to apply for an institutional reading grant from

the Diversity Across the Curriculum (DAC) program. The awarding of the grant provided that each faculty member from the area would read and report on six books related to diversity and education over the course of the following summer and academic year.

Chronology

Over the summer of 2001, one of the EDL faculty members coordinated the development of an on-line forum for accessing the grant bibliography and sharing preliminary thoughts on summer reading. Several of the faculty posted to the on-line forum over the summer months, but the postings were relatively few and infrequent with some faculty members not participating in the forum altogether. While the grant provided a monetary allotment ($1500) for the purchase of books related to racial diversity, it was up to each individual faculty member to make choices from the grant bibliography, order the books and arrange to be reimbursed from the grant monies. All of the faculty members involved with the project are on 9-month contracts and do much of their work away from campus during the summer months. Thus, email communication was used as the primary vehicle for communicating with each other about the early stages of the DAC reading grant process. While several faculty succeeded in purchasing a fairly diverse set of books for grant reading and began some of the reading individually, substantive work as a collective did not resume until nearly 10 weeks into the fall semester. (A table summarizing this chronology is included as Appendix A.) Also, during the summer of 2001, following up on the initial references in the group, the higher education members of the faculty considered in more depth the action research possibilities for the project as a case study focusing on a university faculty professional

development process related to diversity. The project also had the potential to capture a long-term effort in curricular change. Based on the a review of documentation to date and participant observation they designed a more formal approach to the research and submitted a paper proposal to AERA that was shared with the group as a whole.

Eventually, two lunch meetings were scheduled to discuss the DAC reading. The first meeting of the group during the fall semester '01 took place on November 26th and was attended by all but one faculty member involved with the project (six of seven). It was planned that each faculty member would bring a one-page written summary of one book s/he had read for the grant, provide the group with brief highlights orally, followed by a conversation about how the reading might be used to inform our teaching. As it happened, the reading summaries spanned the duration of the 90-minute meeting, thus, the discussion of pedagogical implications was tabled until the next meeting planned for December 10, 2001. Occasionally, in those meetings there was reference to scholarship possibilities implicit in the faculty development work underway.

Prior to adjourning the first meeting, it was decided that the next discussion might allow for more depth and collective focus if a text was selected to read in common. Based on recommendations from several members of the group who highly recommended their selections, it was decided that we would all read Johnson (2001). *Privilege, Power and Difference*, Tatum (1997) *Why are all the Black Kids Sitting Together in the Cafeteria?* and Rothenberg (2001) *Race, Class and Gender in the United States: An Integrated Study*. One faculty member facilitated a collective order and distributed the texts upon their arrival. Since the selected texts did not arrive in time for reading prior to the December meeting, the predominant focus of the discussion was

devoted to pedagogical issues that were not addressed at the previous meeting due to lack of time. Much of the dialogue revolved around questions such as: "How should we deal with student resistance to discussing these issues?," and "What do we do about students who hear an ideology being expressed by the instructor?" "How do we respond to students who think that diversity 'is not an issue' because we live in Maine?"

Subsequent to the conclusion of the December 10th discussion, we worked through the process of reserving dates for Spring semester discussions. It was decided that we would meet once a month and that the Johnson and Tatum texts would serve as the basis for our January discussion, followed by the Rothenberg text in February, and then eventually a discussion of readings related to both privilege and whiteness. At the conclusion to the December 10 meeting, the group agreed that each faculty member would electronically post one or two questions based on the reading to stimulate discussion and to provide more common focus for the January meeting. The January meeting was scheduled for the first day of the semester—a particularly hectic day for many. After a reminder from one of the higher education faculty, three of seven faculty members posted questions providing a loose framework for guiding the discussion at this meeting. The initial question was "What insights [from A. G. Johnson's 2001 book *Privilege, power and difference]* about the relationship of power and privilege have the potential to have the most impact on the way we think about schools?" The question became a springboard to a wide-ranging discussion on numerous topics including examples of effective teaching devices, related movies, and the challenge of sorting out leadership responsibility related to patterns of voluntary racial separation in schools. One voice tried to focus the group when a specific teaching strategy was mentioned by saying,

"Can we stay with that and think it through?" reflecting what was becoming an underlying search for a common focus amidst a complex set of individual needs and interests.

Several weeks before the scheduled February discussion, several faculty members expressed concern that it would not be productive to cover the entire Rothenberg anthology, consisting of dozens of separate articles. Thus, we agreed to read from the first three sections of the five-part text with a focus on how particular readings might inform curricular changes and/or enhancements. A number of faculty members read beyond the first three sections and the discussion centered around the readings that might have the most utility for teaching about diversity in Educational Leadership classes regardless of the section from which it came. As a group, we decided again, that we needed to be more focused in our next discussion. A number of participants voiced concern that discussions remained superficial and that more depth was desired. Thus, we decided to focus our attention on only three articles that emerged from the Rothenberg text as particularly compelling to a number of participants. Thus, *Imagine a Country* by Holly Sklar; *Age, Race, Class and Sex: Women Redefining Difference* by Audre Lorde and *Homophobia as a Weapon of Sexism* by Suzanne Pharr were slated for discussion at the March meeting.

After the December meeting, faculty attention to the DAC grant project was also reinforced by two individual interviews per participant with each of the researchers for this study. While the interviews provided data informing the study, they bear mention here because they appeared to become part of the faculty development process as individuals reflected on the issues, their own engagement in the DAC project, and the

nature of the Educational Leadership curriculum. The interviews, in an environment where professional identity typically includes norms valuing scholarship, served as a vehicle for reifying the faculty development process and perhaps lending more substance to it.

How do individuals and the group think about diversity and its relevance to educational leadership and how does this shift over a two-year period of focused reading and dialogue?

Evolving Focus on Privilege

When asked directly, all participants reported little or no change in their conceptualization of diversity over the first 15 months of the project, citing long-term engagement with diversity issues. Yet, many of the participants went on to discuss the power of the concept of white privilege as an explanatory and teaching tool that was a new one to them. In two cases, participants discussed the value that a conceptual lens can provide in going beyond personal experience relative to a class. In fact, readings and subsequent discussion related to the concept of privilege seemed to mark a turning point in both a collective understanding of diversity issues and how they fit into thinking of the curriculum and leadership. At the beginning, discussions were more diffuse and were more likely to address discrimination against specific groups, while over time there was more discussion about the integration of concepts like privilege throughout courses and the curriculum. Discussion of the concept of privilege focused on its value for helping

students see the relevance of diversity issues to themselves in a predominantly white state.

Dialectic Tension Between Individual Interests and a Common Focus

As noted above, group discussions, especially early, tended to focus in different directions. We appeared to alternate between adopting assignments adapted to our own differences in histories, needs, and interests, and assignments that would provide us a common focus. Summer reading, for example, was diverse but yielded agreement in the fall for the group to focus on two or three books that appeared to have the most relevance to the entire group. Then, discussions of those books tended to be free ranging leading to more statements of the need for a common focus. A consensus decision for each participant to prepare three discussions questions for the next meeting resulted in three sets of questions and no pursuit beyond the first question. There does not appear to be an obvious explanation for the pattern. It may however, reflect continuing tentativeness about risks involved in approaching the issues.

Conscious And Unconscious Efforts To Integrate Diversity Issues In Classes

Regardless of the definition of diversity, over time, there was clearly enhanced commitment to the integration of diversity concerns into the curriculum. Each participant cited specific actions that had occurred in classes with which they were involved as a result of the DAC reading and discussions and the heightened awareness resulting from them. From early discussions about the appropriateness of infusing diversity, the group consistently spoke about the "how" as both common language and a common commitment evolved.

Why does a faculty choose to pursue common exploration of issues related to diversity over an extended period of time?

A rational analysis of this case would place the question of "why" first, assuming that the behavior of the faculty follows from predefined intention. However, based on preliminary analysis of data, and alternative theoretical perspectives (Cohen, March & Olson, 1972, March, 1994), we visit this question later observing that participation was not always driven by project related goals. In effect, both chance events and the project itself helped participants identify goals. In this case, a chance catalyzing event, the defeat at the polls of legislation prohibiting discrimination based in sexual orientation, brought the Educational Leadership faculty together in a common commitment to explore the issue of diversity. However, the individual motivations for participating varied across, and even within, individuals initially and over time. The context of this event relates to some of these motivations.

The fall of 2000 brought with it several other changes affecting the context for hearing interpreting and reacting to the elections results. Two new faculty, had joined the area, one with expertise in K-12 education and the other in higher education; and both women with expertise and experience related to a variety of diversity issues. In addition, the faculty individually and collectively wrestled with the impending loss of a female colleague in the process of an adverse tenure recommendation. Thus, for at least some of those involved, effective induction of new faculty was an active area concern. The education community continued to wrestle with the specter of school violence characterized by the Columbine High School massacre and the apparent role played by hate in an ongoing series of tragedies including subsequent school violence and the

murder of Matthew Shepherd. Thus, the motivations or the "why" of embarking on the series of discussions were varied and in some cases perhaps not clearly articulated. Most faculty members certainly appeared concerned about the presenting issues in terms of the role of intolerance to difference in adversely affecting school and college climates. Other motivations included: opportunities to engage with colleagues about matters of intellectual substance (in professional lives all too often driven by programmatic "nuts and bolts"), to pursue topics of long term personal interest, to get to know one another better, to be a "good colleague," and to be seen as "a good person."

Over time, the "why" evolved for the group and for individuals. The DAC reading grant required a focus on issues related to racial diversity. It also provided a common focus in that there was, in a sense, a contract. We had signed on as a group to do a certain amount of focused reading. Even within the constraints of the DAC grant, there was a range of interests and motivations demonstrated in the choices. In many cases, faculty chose books relevant to specific classes they taught. Or they pursued books that had been of interest and too long deferred.

Related to the direct question of why embark and continue on this kind of project, several themes emerged: (1) It's the "right thing to do" to prepare leaders for educational institutions in a democratic society, (2) it addresses a perceived hole in our curriculum and (3) the project addressed personal interests and (4) the role of past life experience in forging understanding and commitment.

It's the "Right Thing to Do"

All the participants spoke, in some way, to the importance of preparing educational leaders for a pluralistic society. One person commented that "they may go

to diversity or diversity may come to us…it's inevitable…this isn't just about becoming a better leader, it's about doing what's right."

Filling a Curricular Gap

Without exception, the participants viewed the EDL curriculum as lacking in regard to the integration of diversity, in general, and in preparing school leaders for effectively nurturing environments supportive of differences among students and staff. This view was expressed in response to an interview question at the end of 15 months of discussion and reading. A review of meeting notes from the early months of the first year revealed more discussion of the constraints in schools to addressing diversity, suggesting that acknowledging a gap in the curriculum was a view that evolved and solidified as a result of the DAC process.

For several participants, the project raised their sense of how far the curriculum needed to come to be effective. One individual stated "I still think it's important to improve the Ed Leadership curriculum in that area…but now realize we have further to go than I initially thought." Several compared the curriculum with Educational Leadership programs elsewhere in the country with which they were familiar and found it wanting in the limited way diversity was addressed. Almost universally, participants observed that diversity was included based on individual faculty commitment and was not systematically integrated throughout the curriculum.

Personal Interests

In addition to noting values as a driving force, several of the participants noted long-term interest in diversity as a professional interest relative to teaching or

scholarship. Several of the participants had prior professional and scholarly experience related to the role of identity differences in education.

Outcome Of Prior Experience

Universally, participants spoke to the role of prior experience in shaping and/or sharpening the awareness and concern around diversity as an educational issue. One, for example, noted the insights related to class resulting from growing up in an economically underprivileged family, insights related to sexual orientation resulting from seeing the world through the eyes and experiences of his gay son, and that he "was sensitive and purposeful about diversifying my staff as a superintendent" and as Associate Commissioner of Education for the state, he fostered workshops and a statewide conference on gender issues and leadership. He noted on joining the faculty male colleagues would chide him as the feminist professor. Another, deliberately sought a doctoral program in educational leadership with an urban emphasis and a strong focus on diversity because she felt unprepared for school leadership in a southern city after life and professional experiences in white, suburban settings. Another spoke of experience early in his career, in urban schools raising both awareness and commitment that was reaffirmed through the DAC process. He described that experience as translating to sensitivity for other bases of differences than race in coming to Maine and seeing, as a high school principal, students and teachers facing issues of difference in very real ways. Other responses were similar in noting prior experiences in being at least one trigger to an interest in pursuing the DAC project.

What Curricular And Pedagogical Changes Result From This Process?

"It Provides a Different Lens"

A number of participants spoke about changes in their teaching practices due to their increased awareness and/or attention to the issues addressed in the readings and discussions about diversity. The degree to which curricular change was described varied widely. Some reported no change at all, while others reported they had incorporated new readings and experiential learning activities that were direct outcomes of the DAC readings and discussions. Several faculty members acknowledged that even without formal curricular changes yet implemented, their own personal and professional development was enough to spark changes in their classrooms around issues related to diversity. For instance, one faculty member describes that he is more relaxed and comfortable with his ability to navigate the often-contentious terrain of talking about identity differences in class. Referring specifically to the Johnson (2001) text (*Privilege, Power and Difference*) he says, "I had the sensitivity before, but now I've built a cognitive base I didn't have…It provides a different lens…the words/language to describe the issues."

Another faculty member described that conversations regarding leaders' role in incorporating diversity had been emphasized in one of her current courses. For example, in approaching the question, "what does it mean to be an ethical leader?" she has noticed that the discussions have "gone deeper—pushing students beyond the standard 'be honest, truthful, and loyal' to thinking about how to assure that there aren't people in your school as students and faculty members who are not being included in the school community." She adds that she has also been more intentional about making the case that

"differences play a role—and identity differences are not always obvious—and we have plenty" (here in Maine). Another faculty member commented that she is viewing her syllabi differently now. For her, issues of diversity "have moved to be more integral parts of an inclusive whole" rather than simply "issues of diversity" added on to a syllabus. For example, "the history of higher education can't really be considered without factoring in the impact of slavery, colonizing of Indian lands, roles of women etc." Others indicated that not much had changed in their teaching yet. For at least one faculty member, this was because diversity had already been incorporated into course objectives, though she was clear about her interest in doing even more in future courses.

Challenges—"I don't think our people are ready for this"

For those who had not yet made specific changes to their teaching informed by the DAC process, and even for those who had done so, talk of challenges related to presenting "these issues to our students" was a predominant theme throughout the process and emerged in data from both individual interviews and group meetings. The articulated challenges were many including the real and/or perceived risks associated with talking about diversity in the classroom—also commonly described as student resistance and/or "backlash" toward the instructor. For instance, on several occasions, one faculty member described his experiences as a former graduate student in Educational Leadership in a course where the professor attempted to integrate issues of diversity, "I saw the wall of resistance from potential administrators…they were so focused on nuts and bolts, they were unable to identify with race, class and gender or equity of opportunity." Another faculty member shared his view that sometimes students tend to "seize up when addressing these issues" in classes. "They feel you're telling them what to think." The

challenge is expressed in the question of "how can we find ways to create more authentic learning experiences for students around these issues rather than running the risk of students "feeling as though they are pressured to acquire the instructor's value system." This challenge was articulated and discussed among participants during several group sessions. On a number of occasions, success stories were shared by faculty members who had positive experiences working through student resistance and had developed pedagogical strategies for mitigating backlash. Nevertheless, anxieties around student resistance and possible backlash were a major theme that emerged from our analysis of the data.

"Scratching their heads"

A similar challenge articulated was also related to the practice of teaching, but centered on the difficulties of "making the case" or dealing with student indifference about issues of diversity. For instance, one participant described an experience of bringing diversity issues to the fore in a classroom discussion where "students thought it wasn't relevant or practical for them" and were unclear about why this was an important issue for discussion. Another commented that, "the challenge is that presenting issues of diversity would cause students to scratch their heads." Implicit in this challenge is the context of teaching courses with students who reside in Maine. When students assume that diversity implies discussion of race relations primarily, they frequently express the view "It's Maine, we don't have problems with that here. " An inherent challenge related to talking about diversity with students accustomed to living in a predominantly white region is the need to move students away from thinking of diversity in overly simplistic terms (diversity = racial differences) and/or dichotomous terms (i.e. diversity = black &

white; or white and people of color) while at the same time avoiding the trap of making racial differences seem somehow unimportant, trivial or invisible.

Resources Constraints: Time and Materials

Another major sub-theme of pedagogical challenges is lack of time. Related to this is the real and/or perceived lack of easily accessible teaching materials designed to integrate diversity in educational leadership courses—and the seemingly daunting task of developing these "from scratch." Across the board, faculty voiced their desire to have "better case studies," and other classroom exercises that would serve as pedagogical tools for teaching about diversity. In addition to needing more time to develop workable pedagogical strategies that would support teaching about diversity and related concepts, without exception, faculty voiced the need to spend more time as a group talking about our learning from the DAC grant reading and sharing ideas for diversifying our curricula. For example, one faculty member echoed sentiments shared by others commenting "we need more intensive time, it's (talk of diversity) is skittering on the surface right now—it's very safe, but we haven't given the time to it frequently enough" to get into the depth that is needed.

Plans:

While not all faculty members had formally translated their learning from the DAC process to their classroom teaching, without exception, all of the participants articulated their intentions to do so in future courses. One challenge related to this is team-teaching (a common practice in the K-12 leadership program), which requires more than simply individual willingness to address diversity, but agreement among colleagues about "how to do *it*, and what *it* is." As a whole however, there is expressed agreement

among the group that these issues are relevant to the curricula of educational leadership and there is a desire to more fully integrate diversity across the curriculum and continue to develop cognitive and experiential foundations for teaching about difference, privilege, oppression and other concepts that can serve as lenses for understanding diversity in more substantive ways.

INTERPRETATIONS

There were a number of themes related to the faculty development process, group dynamics, curricular change, and the dynamics of diversity that emerged from analysis of the individual research questions.

The Project as "Attention Magnet"

As with any change process in a complex organization, the ability to attract and maintain attention relative to a given issue is a key determinant to the long-term likelihood of successful change. (March and Olsen, 1976, Cohen, March and Olsen, 1973) Through our analysis, we have identified multiple factors that drew a group of faculty members to endorse and sustain involvement in a curriculum transformation project like this.

In seeking a way to make sense of the interplay of these factors we were drawn to a metaphor of magnetic processes. We can imagine faculty attention resources as steel shavings in a field of magnetic bars of varying size and strength, each representing a different demand on faculty time and attention. Each of the magnetic bars, including that representing the project, may gain or lose magnetic force depending on forces charging or draining it. In this case, the magnetizing forces were many, varied, loosely coupled, and subject to chance. However, they had the same affect of pulling people together toward a

similar undertaking. Thus, where the initial commitment was unlikely to sustain the initial good intentions (in the face of competing teaching, research and service demands on faculty);a series of circumstances, each relatively minor in itself, in the aggregate, enhanced the draw for faculty attention to the DAC project magnet. While there had been various university efforts to encourage faculty attention to diversity, thus creating the "diversity magnet," enhancing factors or charges to the magnet for this group of faculty included: (1) the introduction of two new faculty members helping to create a critical mass of those with interest and commitment to the issues, (2) catalyzing event such as the election results, (3) series of group meetings with strong norms for attendance and prior "homework," (4) the DAC grant with its expectation for ongoing focus and an eventual outcome, (5) individual predisposition to the concerns based in prior life experiences and scholarly interests and (6) the research project and associated activities calling for further individual attention to and reflection on the project. While any one of these events may not have sustained a commitment to the project their cumulative effect was to strengthen the "magnetic draw."

We can extend the metaphor by remembering that magnets have two poles-- one attracting and the other repelling. In regards to organizational processes, repelling forces are the implicit disincentives for engaging with a given issue, project, or program. We saw in this case, evidence of a number of repelling forces implicit in the "diversity magnet": fear of: failure, conflict and controversy, indifference and even hostility among constituents; and, finally, uncertainty about how to do it "right" or even about what "it" is.

The metaphor helps explain another phenomenon implicit in examining this case study: depending on the lenses through which it is viewed, the story may be interpreted in very different ways. From one perspective, it is a success story about a group who made the time to come together to address a critical and difficult issue across the curriculum. The group succeeded in doing the hard work over time to make substantive change. From another perspective, it can be viewed as the story of a group who failed to reach deep enough to find more time to push the difficult process more quickly and decisively and to move beyond mostly talking about the issues to realizing substantive curricular change. Just as the magnet has positive and negative poles, both these stories can be understood as valid and relevant

Silences

Thus far, our analysis has drawn primarily upon data produced by "what was said" in individual interviews and group meetings. It is important to our analysis however, that we also consider what was unspoken—the silences that may also speak to our research questions. While this is a helpful practice for qualitative analysis in general, it is especially relevant to our study in that the project we investigate is focused on issues of identity differences where the "invisibility of privilege and silence are central concepts.

As described by Peggy McIntosh (1988) in her classic essay "Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack," identity privilege operates as a package of "unearned assets" that is largely invisible to those who possess it. She and others have described the challenges associated with recognizing one's own privilege—a process McIntosh refers to as "doing the arithmetic of the upside." Detailing a number of common ways in which privilege

can be ignored, Allan Johnson (2001) describes how well meaning whites remain complicit in racism by acknowledging the problems of discrimination, but failing to acknowledge how their whiteness provides them with daily advantages that are inevitably linked to others' disadvantage. In other words, they are very aware of how racial discrimination is likely to shape the experiences of people of color, but not as keenly aware of how their racial privilege has shaped their experiences as a white person. The same can be said for men in relation to male privilege, heterosexuals in relation to sexual orientation privilege and so forth. In this case, the participants spoke to the power of this concept in providing a powerful new lens for teaching and working with students around issues related to diversity.

That said, we turn to a discussion of the silences related to privilege and power dynamics among participants in this curriculum transformation project. As described earlier, the group of faculty members engaged in this curriculum transformation project are all white, from Judeo-Christian roots—and currently middle-class. Throughout the process, much discussion involved reflecting on personal experiences that led us to care about these issues, however, comparatively little attention was paid to unpacking the "invisible knapsacks" we carry today as privileged whites (and men, and heterosexuals etc.) Privilege was not ignored as a concept—in fact, it was rigorously discussed—but primarily as a potential teaching tool in relation to students who "don't see why race is an issue in Maine." Reflection of our own privilege is relevant in order to experientially understand the creation of inclusive classrooms to which we are committed. Discussion of privilege related to our own process of "un-packing" was fairly limited in scope and depth. Thus, for example, we failed to consistently consider, as a group, how our own

white privilege (and for some —male privilege and heterosexual privilege as well) might prevent us from clearly seeing problems in our pedagogy and curricula. The exception to this was in the very early stages of our project when we invited students of color and GLBT-identified students to join us for a focused discussion related to their classroom experiences and recommendations for improvement. Otherwise, despite acknowledgment of individual privilege in interviews, as a group, we did not systematically consider strategies for unpacking our own privilege as we engaged in the curriculum transformation process.

In addition to the silences about the ways in which white privilege currently shapes our personal lives and our roles as teachers in classrooms, there was, in retrospect, remarkable silence about how various forms of privilege and disadvantage might affect the dynamics within our group of faculty. Even as we did not systematically reckon with our sameness as whites, we also did not explicitly address our differences as men and women, straight and lesbian, tenured and untenured—and how these differences and accordant power differentials might affect interactions among group members in general and in this particular process under investigation. There maybe a number of reasons this has not occurred: insufficient personal trust with one another in the group (one interviewee specifically spoke to the evolving trust in the group with hope of eventual increased personal engagement); a perceived lack of safety implicit in the various power differentials within the group; not viewing reflective self-examination as relevant to pedagogical and curricular issues; and individual needs to gain greater comfort and understanding of the concept of privilege before applying it. For many reasons, this is obviously complex and risky terrain, which likely accounts, at least in part, for the silence

we experienced around these issues. We also know that silence can be a powerful force in maintaining status quo. Thus, when dealing with a social change project such as this, it seems particularly important that strategies to address silences like these are developed in order to maintain the integrity of the project.

IMPLICATIONS

We have experienced, as both participants and researchers, the challenges of working toward substantive curricular change relative to identity differences. At the same time, this work has been gratifying in many respects. We are truly grateful to our colleagues for choosing to engage in a curricular transformation process and for making additional time to participate in the project as a form of action research.

This analysis has provided important insights about how and why a faculty group made time to come together to think about meanings of diversity for an Educational Leadership graduate curriculum as well as the strengths and limitations of that undertaking. It is clear that many factors, both enabling and inhibiting, influenced this process. While some are seemingly random and specific to a particular context, several have emerged as particularly powerful forces worth considering for transferability to other settings. The importance of these factors is underscored by our observation that this effort was fragile enough (in the face of many competing demands) it probably would not have sustained momentum had there been many further impediments (for instance—if we all had to use personal finances to pay for reading materials—or, we did not feel some sense of obligation to meet regularly to discuss the reading). Building on the "attention magnet" metaphor, we suggest the following points:

Enhancing/Attracting Factors

- **Institutionalized Support—Diversity Across the Curriculum Grant Funding**. This factor was exceedingly important in that it required an element of psychological commitment among the faculty to endorse the idea and then it required a certain degree of follow-through to uphold the "contract." Not unimportantly, the grant provided funding for reading materials that served as the centerpiece of this project. While the institutional outlay may have been relatively modest, the outcome in faculty commitment and learning was probably far greater than alternative investment of the dollars.
- **Action Research Model** served to provide further structure for reflection, focus and commitment.
- **Catalyzing Event(s)**—In this particular case, circumstances surrounding a failed statewide referendum to support GLBT civil rights, and the induction of new faculty members seemed to provide some impetus for action.
- **Individual Predispositions**—The interest and experience of each participant provided energy toward the project.

Inhibiting/Repelling Factors

- **Fears and Risks** associated with working through issues of identity differences individually and as part of a group of professional colleagues. This includes the **challenges of uncovering invisible privileges** as they operate in our daily lives and in interactions with our colleague group.

- **Lack of time/Competing Demands**
- **Limited/superficial understanding and/or engagement** both individually and collectively.

The immediate goal of the project in which we are engaged, and simultaneously investigating as a form of action research, is to fully integrate diversity-related issues into the Educational Leadership curricula. We have learned much to date, and are hopeful the findings presented in this paper will serve to open up possibilities for enhancing our curricular change efforts. As our faculty group continues to engage in focused dialogues and reading reflections around diversity, we hope to continue the process by exploring inhibiting factors in more extensive ways. We need to acknowledge the fears and risks and learn about ways of working through these, as individuals and as members of a group. Likewise, we need to explore further what factors can help us to sustain this effort, allowing us to go deeper, in the face of competing demands on faculty time.

The study suggests institutional implications for faculty development strategies and continuing institutional support for strengthening curricular inclusivity. It illustrates a grassroots faculty development approach emerging from the faculty itself rather than from an outside "expert" that coincidentally required a more modest institutional financial investment. In addition, the findings from this study highlight the need for continued development and distribution of faculty development opportunities and teaching tools designed to integrate diversity in Educational Leadership courses.

This project began, and remains grounded in, a larger goal of contributing to social change—to support educational leaders who are committed to developing

educational environments where learning can be optimized for all students regardless of any perception of differences, even those not obvious. In light of the "bigger picture" we are hopeful that this examination will lend itself to informing and enhancing similar work in process and/or inspire such work that has not yet begun among Educational Leadership faculties elsewhere.

APPENDIX A
EDL Diversity Across the Curriculum Timeline

DATE	EVENT
September 2000	Two new faculty join EDL staff both with interest and experience with issues of diversity. Both women, they also create a critical mass of women and those interested in diversity as a focus.
November 10, 2000	Discussed idea of having focused dialogues at EDL retreat in Bar Harbor…triggered by week's election failing to ratify gay rights legislation
November 29, 2000	12:30-2pm diversity brown bag with EDL (viewed It's Elementary)
Feb. 21, 2001	12:30-2pm lunch meeting with student panel
March 28, 2001	Faculty retreat re: meaning of leadership
April 18, 2001	12:30-2pm diversity brown bag with EDL
May-June 2001	EDL faculty member, in collaboration with area faculty develops DAC grant proposal to fund faculty readings around diversity. Grant proposal is funded.
June-July 2001	Research possibilities discussed at June faculty retreat. Action Research/Case Study Proposal drafted by 2 EDL faculty members (from higher ed concentration)
July-September 2001	Purchase texts with DAC grant funding. Begin individual reading. Dialogue begins via email.
October-December 2001	Scheduling and implementation of two focused dialogues to discuss DAC reading. Agreement to focus on some common readings three books each are ordered for each faculty member (those who don't already own them) see below for specific dates
November 26, 2001	12-1:30 DAC Diversity Brown bag: Regroup—review spectrum of summer

	reading
December 17, 2001	12-1:30 DAC Diversity Brown bag: Johnson and Tatum
January 22, 2002	11:30-1 DAC Diversity Brown bag: Johnson and Tatum
January-March2002	Individual interviewing to further explore perspectives and processes for research aspects of project; (2 each faculty member)
February 28, 2002	11:30-1 DAC Diversity Brown bag: Rothenberg
March 26, 2002	11:30-1 DAC Diversity Brown bag: Rothenberg

References

Angelo, T. A. (1993). A "teacher's dozen": Fourteen general, research-based principles for improving higher learning in our classrooms. *AAHE Bulletin*. 45(8): 3-7, 13.

Argyris, Chris, and Schön, Donald A. (1996) *Organisational learning II: theory, method and practice*. Reading: Addison-Wesley.

Baiocco, S. A. & DeWaters, J. N. (1998). *Successful college teaching: Problem-solving strategies of distinguished professors*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Bensimon, E. M. (1993). *Redesigning collegiate leadership: Teams and teamwork in higher education*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Bensimon, E. M., Neumann, A. & Birnbaum, R. (1989). Higher education and leadership theory. In *Making sense of administrative leadership*. ASHE-ERIC Research Report, 1.

Berg, B. L. (2001). *Qualitative research methods for the social sciences*. 4th ed. Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Bogdan, R. C. & Biklen, S, K. (1992). *Qualitative research for education: An introduction to theory and methods*. (2nd ed.). Boston: Allyn and Bacon.

Cameron, K. S. (1989) Organizational Adaptation and Higher Education. *Journal of Higher Education, vol. 55, April/May.*

Capper, C. (1993). (Ed.) Educational administration in a pluralistic society. SUNY Press.

Chickering, A. W. & Kytle, J. (1999). The collegiate ideal in the twenty-first century. In Toma, J. D., Kezar, A. J. (Eds.). *Reconceptualizing the collegiate ideal*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Chism, N. V. (1999). Taking student diversity into account. In McKeachie, W. J. (1999). *Teaching tips: Strategies, research, and theory for College and University teachers*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Clark, C. & O'Donnell, J. (Eds.) (1999). *Becoming and unbecoming white*. Westport, CT: Bergin and Garvey.

Coffey, A. & Atkinson, P. (1996). *Making sense of qualitative data*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cohen, Michael D. and James G. March. (1974). *Leadership and Ambiguity: The American College President.* New York: McGraw Hill.

Cohen, M.D., March, J.G., and Olsen, J.P. (1972). A garbage can model of organizational choice. *Administrative Schience Quarterly* 17: 1-25.

Coghlan, David, and Brannick, Teresa (2001) *Doing research in your own organization.* London: Sage.

Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cross, P. K. (1998). *What do we know about students' learning and how do we know it?* Speech delivered at AAHE National Conference on Higher Education, Atlanta Georgia, March 24, 1998.

Ellsworth, E. & Miller, J. L. (1996). Working difference in education. *Curriculum Inquiry,* 26(3), 245-263.

Fine, M., Powell, L., Weiss, L. & Wong, L. M. (1998). (Eds). *Off white: Readings on race, power and society.* New York: Routledge.

Frankenberg, R. (1994). *White women, race matters: The social construction of whiteness.* Minneapolis, MN: University of Minnesota Press.

Gay, G. & Banks, J. (2000). *Culturally responsive teaching: Theory, research, and practice.* New York: Teachers College Press.

Glazer, J. (1999). *Shattering the myths: Women in academe.* Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Glesne, C. (1999). Becoming qualitative researchers. 2nd ed. New York: Longman Press.

Grant, C. A. & Gomez, M. L. (2000). *Campus and classroom: Making schooling multicultural.* River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

hooks, b. (1994). *Teaching to transgress: Education as the practice of freedom.* New York: Routledge.

Johnson, A. G. (2001). *Privilege, power and difference.* Mountain View, CA: Mayfield Publishing.

Kanter, R. M. (1977). *Men and women of the corporation.* New York: Basic Books.

Kezar, A (2001) *Organizational Change in the 21st Century: Recent Research and Conceptualizations*; ASHE-ERIC Research volume 28 number 4 , San Francisco: Jossey Bass.

Kincheloe, J., Steinberg, S. R., Rodgriguez, N. M. & R. E. Chennault (Eds.). *White reign: Deploying whiteness in America*. New York: St. Martin's Press.

Kingston-Mann, E. and Sieber, T. R. (Eds.). (2001). *Achieving against the odds: How academics become teachers of diverse students*. Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Lincoln, Y. S. & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Lindsey, R. B., Robins, K. N., & R. Terrell. (1999). *Cultural proficiency: A manual for school leaders*. Corwin Press.

McCormick, T. M. (1994). *Creating the nonsexist classroom: A multicultural approach*. New York: Teachers College Press.

McIntosh, P. (1993). White privilege and male privilege: A personal account of coming to see correspondences through work in women's studies. In Minas, A. (Ed.). *Gender basics: Feminist perspectives on women and men*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth Press.

McIntosh, P. (1988, 2000). White privilege: Unpacking the invisible knapsack. In Rothenberg, Paula S. (2000). *Race,class, and gender in the United States*, 5th Ed. New York: Worth Publishers.

McKeachie, W. J. (1999). *Teaching tips: Strategies, research, and theory for College and University teachers*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

March, J.G. (1994). *A primer on decision making: How decisions happen*. New York: Free Press.

March, J.G. and Olsen, J.P. (1976). Attention and the ambiguity of self-interest. In March, J.G. and Olsen, J.P. *Ambiguity and choice in organizations. Bergen, Norway:* Universitetsforlaget.

Miles, M. G. & Huberman, A. M. (1984). *Qualitative data analysis: A sourcebook of new methods*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Morey, A. I. & Kitano, M. K. (Eds.). (1996). *Multicultural course transformation in higher education: A broader truth*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn and Bacon.

Nieto, S. (1999). *The light in their eyes: Creating multicultural learning communities*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Orfield, G. (Ed). (2001). *Diversity challenged: Evidence on the impact of affirmative action*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Civil Rights Project.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. 2nd ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rothenberg, Paula S. (2000). *Race,class, and gender in the United States*, 5th Ed. New York: Worth Publishers.

Shakeshaft, C. (1989). *Women in educational administration*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications.

Sporn, Barbara. (1999). *Adaptive University Structures: An Analysis of Adaptation to Socioeconomic Environments of US and European Universities*. London and Philadelphia: Jessica Kingsley Publishers Ltd. Higher Education Policy Series 54.

Tierney, W. G. (1993). *Building communities of difference: Higher education in the 21st century*. Bergin & Garvey.

Turner, C., Garcia, M., Nora, A. & L. I. Rendon (Eds.) (1996). *Racial and ethnic diversity in higher education*. ASHE Reader Series. Needham Heights, MA: Simon and Schuster Custom Publishing.

Walsh, D. J. & Maffei, M. J. (1995). Never in a class by themselves: An examination of behaviors affecting the student-professor relationship. *Journal of Excellence in College Teaching*. 5 23-49.

Weedon, C. (1999). *Feminism, theory and the politics of difference*. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishers.

Weick, K.E. (1976) Educational organizations as loosely coupled systems. *Administrative Science Quarterly* 21, 1-19.

West, C. & Fenstermaker, S. (1995). Doing difference. *Gender & Society, 91*, 3-37.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

ERIC

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Difference, Disadvantage, Privilege and Us: Examining Meanings of Diversity Among Educational Leadership Faculty

Author(s): Elizabeth J. Allan + Suzanne E. Estler

Corporate Source:

Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1 ↑ ☑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A ↑ ☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B ↑ ☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: Elizabeth J. Allan / Suzanne E. Estler

Printed Name/Position/Title: Assistant Professor

Organization/Address: University of Maine, Orono, ME 04473

Telephone: 207-581-3166 FAX: 207-581-3120

E-Mail Address: elizabeth.allan@umit.maine.edu Date: 4/15/02

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, or, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON ASSESSMENT AND EVALUATION
UNIVERSITY OF MARYLAND
1129 SHRIVER LAB
COLLEGE PARK, MD 20742-5701
ATTN: ACQUISITIONS

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfac.piccard.csc.com

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2000)